

**REMARKS**

This Amendment, submitted in response to the Office Action dated November 14, 2007, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 and 10-18 are all the claims pending in the present application. Claims 2, 4, 6-8, 10 and 12-14 have been withdrawn from consideration.

**I. Rejection of claims 1, 11 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 11 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masaki et al. (JP Pub. No. 07-007810, hereafter "Masaki") in view of Shirakawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,843,335, hereafter "Masaki"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

**Claim 1**

The Examiner concedes that Masaki does not teach the use of a metal plate in the connection of the battery to the inverter as claimed and cites Shirakawa to cure the deficiency.

The Examiner asserts that "[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Masaki to use a metal plate to directly connect the battery and the inverter in order to secure the components and to reduce the need mounting space in the vehicle." Office Action, pg. 3-4. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Masaki Fig. 1 discloses an inverter 6 and a battery 12 enclosed in an electromagnetic shielding container 14. Therefore, assuming *arguendo*, Shirakawa discloses the claimed plate, there is no need for an electric connection body for electrically connecting the battery and the inverter unit of Masaki since the battery and inverter unit of Masako are already housed in the electromagnetic shielding container 14. There is no teaching or suggestion in Masako regarding

the connection between the battery and the inverter unit, therefore it is evident that the Examiner's reasoning is merely a result of hindsight.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims should be deemed allowable.

**Claim 11**

Claim 11 recites, *inter alia*, "wherein the inverter unit is **held and fixed** to the battery by the electric connection body for electrically connecting the battery and the inverter unit." In rejecting claim 11, the Examiner merely states that the inverter 6 of Masaki is secured in a housing to the battery 12 by connection wires and secured in the housing. However, as discussed above with respect to claim 1, the electric connection body is a metal plate. There is no teaching or suggestion that the battery 57 of Shirakawa is held and fixed to the inverter 1. Further, there is no teaching or suggestion that the wires of Masaki hold and fix the inverter 6 to the battery 12. Specifically, there is no teaching or suggestion in the references regarding the claimed language.

In view of the forgoing, claim 11 should be deemed allowable.

**Claim 16**

Claim 16 recites, *inter alia* "an attachment plate which is fixed integrally with the inverter unit, and wherein a battery fixing plate is integrally welded or caulked to the attachment plate." The Examiner asserts that Shirakawa teaches the use of a planar conducting member which is fixed with the inverter unit. To the best of Applicant's understanding, the Examiner appears to be citing conductor plate 21 for teaching the claimed attachment plate. However, the conductor plate 21 was previously cited by the Examiner for teaching the claimed electronic

connection body. The same aspect of a reference cannot be cited for teaching distinctly different claim elements.

Moreover, Applicant submits that the Examiner has not shown where the battery fixing plate as recited in claim 16 is disclosed in the cited art. Applicant submits that a battery fixing plate which is integrally welded or caulked to the attachment plate as claimed is not disclosed in the art cited by the Examiner.

For at least the above reasons, claim 16 should be deemed allowable.

**II. Rejection of claims 3 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 3 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masaki in view of Shirakawa in view of Saka et al. (JP Pub. No. 2004-120936). Claims 3 and 5 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claim 1 for at least the reasons set forth above. Moreover, Saka does not cure the deficiencies of Masaki and Shirakawa.

**III. Rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masaki in view of Shirakawa in further view of Becker (U.S. Patent No. 4,535,863). Claim 15 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency on independent claim 1 for at least the reasons set forth above. Moreover, Becker does not cure the deficiencies of Masaki and Shirakawa.

Claim 15 recites “a battery tray, wherein said battery is positioned in said battery tray, and wherein said metal plate is fixed to the battery tray.” The Examiner concedes that Masaki and Shirakawa do not disclose the claimed battery tray and cites Becker to cure the deficiency.

However, assuming *arguendo* Becker teaches the claimed battery tray, there is no teaching or suggestion that a metal plate is fixed to the battery tray as claimed.

Therefore, claim 15 should be deemed allowable.

**IV. Rejection of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masaki in view of Shirakawa in further view of Tamba et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,621,701). Claim 17 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency on independent claim 1 for at least the reasons set forth above. Moreover, Tamba does not cure the deficiencies of Shirakawa..

**V. New Claim**

Applicant has added claim 18 to provide a more varied scope of protection. Claim 18 should be deemed allowable by virtue of its dependency to claim 1 for at least the reasons set forth above. Moreover, the art cited by the Examiner does not teach the elements of claim 18.

**VI. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

**AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111**  
U.S. Appln. No.: 10/809,870

**Attorney Docket No.: Q80584**

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ruthleen E. Uy/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

---

Ruthleen E. Uy  
Registration No. 51,361

Date: February 14, 2008